

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

KEVIN GRECO, on behalf of himself and all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

-v-

ALLIED DATA CORPORATION and  
JOHN DOES 1-25,

Defendant.

Civil Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**CIVIL ACTION**

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT  
AND  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff, KEVIN GRECO (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”), a New Jersey resident, brings this class action complaint by and through his attorneys, Marcus Law, LLC, against Defendant ALLIED DATA CORPORATION (hereinafter “Defendant”), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff’s counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff’s personal knowledge.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. § 2201. If applicable, the Court also has pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

3. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of New Jersey consumers seeking redress for Defendant’s actions of using an unfair and unconscionable means to collect a

debt.

4. Defendant's actions violated § 1692 et seq. of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act (“FDCPA”) which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive and unfair practices.
5. Plaintiff is seeking damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

### **PARTIES**

6. Plaintiff is a natural person and a resident of the State of New Jersey, and is a “Consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692(a)(3).
7. Defendant is a collection agency with its principal office located at 13111 Westheimer Road, Suite 400, Houston, Texas 77077-5547.
8. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.
9. Defendant is a “debt collector,” as defined under the FDCPA under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
10. John Does 1-25, are fictitious names of individuals and businesses alleged for the purpose of substituting names of Defendants whose identities will be disclosed in discovery and should be made parties to this action.

### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

11. Plaintiff brings claims, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (hereinafter “FRCP”) Rule 23, individually and on behalf of the following New Jersey consumer class (the “Class”):

- All New Jersey consumers who were sent collection letters and/or notice from

Defendant attempting to collect an obligation owed to or allegedly owed to Seventh Avenue that contain at least one of the alleged violations arising from Defendant's violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692 *et seq.*.

- The Class period begins one year to the filing of this Action.

13. The Class satisfies all the requirements of Rule 23 of the FRCP for maintaining a class action:

- Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable because there are hundreds and/or thousands of persons who have received debt collection letters and/or notices from the Defendant that violate specific provisions of the FDCPA. Plaintiff is complaining of a standard form letter and/or notice that is sent to hundreds of persons (*See Exhibit A*, except that the undersigned attorney has, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2 partially redacted the financial account numbers in an effort to protect Plaintiff's privacy);
- There are questions of law and fact which are common to the Class and which predominate over questions affecting any individual Class member. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:
  - a. Whether Defendant violated various provisions of the FDCPA;
  - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendant's conduct;
  - c. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages and are entitled to restitution as a result of Defendant's wrongdoing and if so, what is the proper measure and appropriate statutory formula to

be applied in determining such damages and restitution; and

d. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to declaratory and/or injunctive relief.

- Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class, which all arise from the same operative facts and are based on the same legal theories.
- Plaintiff has no interest adverse or antagonistic to the interest of the other members of the Class.
- Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the Class and has retained experienced and competent attorneys to represent the Class.
- A Class Action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims herein asserted. Plaintiff anticipates that no unusual difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action.
- A Class Action will permit large numbers of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously and without the duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would engender. Class treatment will also permit the adjudication of relatively small claims by many Class members who could not otherwise afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein. Absent a Class Action, class members will continue to suffer losses of statutory protected rights as well as monetary damages. If Defendant's conduct is allowed proceed to without remedy they will continue to reap and retain the proceeds of their ill-gotten gains.

- Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the entire Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

### **ALLEGATIONS OF FACT**

13. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered "1" through "12" herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
14. Some time prior to February 28, 2014, an obligation was allegedly incurred to Seventh Avenue. ("Seventh")
15. The Seventh obligation arose out of a transaction in which money, property, insurance or services, which are the subject of the transaction, are primarily for personal, family or household purposes.
16. The alleged Seventh obligation is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
17. Seventh is a "creditor" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(4).
18. Defendant contends that the Seventh debt is past due.
19. Defendant collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone and internet.
20. Seventh directly or through an intermediary contracted Defendant to collect the BIPG debt.
21. On or about February 28, 2014, the Defendant caused to be delivered to the Plaintiff a collection letter in an attempt to collect the alleged Seventh debt. *See Exhibit A.*
22. The February 28, 2014 letter was sent or caused to be sent by persons employed by

Defendant as a “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).

23. The February 28, 2014 letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(2).

24. The Defendant’s February 28, 2014 letter states in part:

“If you would like to pay by credit card We accept Visa, Mastercard, and Discover Please Call 1-800-275-7176 Ext 602 There is a fee for credit card payments.”

25. Defendant’s February 28, 2014 letter further states:

“Should you have any questions, or wish to pay by phone, call our courteous staff at 1-800-275-7176 ext. 602. There is a fee for check by phone.”

26. Upon information and belief, the Defendant has no legal or contractual right to charge a fee for credit card payments or checks by phone.

27. The February 8, 2014 letter was sent in an envelope that contained a glassine window.

28. Visible through the glassine window was the Plaintiff’s name, Plaintiff’s address, and the Plaintiff’s reference number with the Defendant.

29. The reference number constitutes personal identifying information.

30. The reference number is not meaningless – it is a piece of information capable of identifying [the consumer] as a debtor, and its disclosure has the potential to cause harm to a consumer that the FDCPA was enacted to address. Douglass v. Convergent Outsourcing, 765 F. 3d 299 (Third Cir. 2014).

31. Defendant’s actions as described herein are part of a pattern and practice used to collect consumer debts.

32. Defendant could have taken the steps necessary to bring its actions within compliance with the FDCPA, but neglected to do so and failed to adequately review its actions to

ensure compliance with the law.

33. On information and belief, Defendant sent a written communication, in the form annexed hereto as **Exhibit A** to at least 50 natural persons in the State of New Jersey within one year of the date of this Complaint.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**  
**15 U.S.C. §1692f et seq.**

34. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “34” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
35. Defendant’s debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f of the FDCPA.
36. Pursuant to 15 USC §1692f(1), a debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt. Without limiting the general application of the foregoing, the following conduct is a violation of this section: (1) The collection of any amount (including interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principal obligation) unless such amount is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law.
37. The Defendant violated said section by advising the Plaintiff that they accept credit card payments, directing him to their toll free number and informing him that there is a fee associated with credit card payments.
38. The Defendant further violated said section by charging a fee for a check by phone payment.

39. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692f(8), a debt collector is prohibited from using any language or symbol, other than the debt collector's address, on any envelope when communicating with the consumer by use of mails.

40. The Defendant violated said section by putting the Plaintiff's reference number visible on the February 28, 2014 letter.

41. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692f *et seq.* of the FDCPA, actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative, and Ari Marcus, Esq., as Class Counsel;
- (b) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
- (c) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
- (d) Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
- (e) Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and
- (f) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 12, 2015

/s/ Ari Marcus  
Ari Marcus, Esq.  
MARCUS LAW, LLC  
1500 Allaire Avenue, Suite 101  
Ocean, New Jersey 07712  
(732) 660-8169 telephone  
(732) 298-6256 facsimile



*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: February 12, 2015

/s/ Ari Marcus  
Ari Marcus, Esq.

**CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 11.2**

I, Ari H. Marcus, the undersigned attorney of record for Plaintiff, do hereby certify to my own knowledge and based upon information available to me at my office, the matter in controversy is not the subject of any other action now pending in any court or in any arbitration or administrative proceeding.

Dated: February 12, 2015

/s/ Ari Marcus  
Ari Marcus, Esq.